

A note on n -centralizer finite rings

Jutirekha Dutta, Dhiren K. Basnet and Rajat K. Nath*

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tezpur University,
Napaam-784028, Sonitpur, Assam, India.
Emails: jutirekhadutta@yahoo.com, dbasnet@tezu.ernet.in and
rajatkantinath@yahoo.com**

Abstract

Let R be a finite ring and let $\text{Cent}(R)$ denote the set of all distinct centralizers of R . R is called an n -centralizer ring if $|\text{Cent}(R)| = n$. In this paper, we characterize n -centralizer finite rings for $n \leq 7$.

Key words: finite ring, n -centralizer ring.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16U70.

1 Introduction

Let F be an algebraic system having finite number of elements which is closed under a multiplication operation. Let $\text{Cent}(F)$ denote the set $\{C(x) : x \in F\}$ where $C(x) = \{y \in F : xy = yx\}$ is called the centralizer of x in F . F is called n -centralizer if $|\text{Cent}(F)| = n$. The study of finite n -centralizer group was initiated by Belcastro and Sherman [7] in the year 1994. Since then many mathematician have studied n -centralizer group for different values of n . Characterizations of finite n -centralizer groups for $n = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$ and 9 can be found in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10]. In [12], the authors have initiated the study of finite n -centralizer rings and characterized n -centralizer finite rings for $n = 4, 5$. Further, Dutta has extended the characterizations of 4-centralizer groups and rings to infinite case in [10] and [11] respectively. In this paper, we give a characterization of n -centralizer finite rings

*Corresponding author

for $n = 6, 7$ including a new characterization for $n = 4, 5$. The problem of characterizing finite rings has received considerable attention in recent years (see [6, 8, 9, 14, 15] etc.) starting from the works of Eldridge [13] and Raghavendran [17].

2 Preliminaries

In this section first we describe some notations and prove some results which are useful for the subsequent sections. Throughout this paper R denotes a finite ring. For any subring S of R , R/S or $\frac{R}{S}$ denotes the additive quotient group and $|R : S|$ denotes the index of the additive subgroup S in the additive group R . Note that the isomorphisms considered are the additive group isomorphisms. Also for any two non-empty subsets A and B of R , we define $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$. We shall use the fact that for any non-commutative ring R , the additive group $\frac{R}{Z(R)}$ is not a cyclic group (see [16, Lemma 1]) where $Z(R) = \{s \in R : rs = sr \text{ for all } r \in R\}$ is the center of R .

In [12], we have observed that there is no 2,3-centralizer ring. We also have the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *Let R be a non-commutative ring. Then*

- (a) $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ if and only if $|R : Z(R)| = 4$ (see [12, Theorem 3.2]).
- (b) $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$ if and only if $|R : Z(R)| = 9$ (see [12, Theorem 4.3]).

A family of proper subgroups of a group G is called a cover of G if G is the union of those subgroups. A cover $X = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k\}$ of G is called irredundant if no proper subset of X is also a cover of G . In this paper, we shall use frequently the following two results regarding cover and irredundant cover of a group, proved by Tomkinson [18].

Lemma 2.2 ([18], Lemma 3.3). *Let M be a proper subgroup of the (finite) group G and let $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k$ be subgroups with $|G : H_i| = \beta_i$ and $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \beta_k$. If $G = M \cup H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_k$, then $\beta_1 \leq k$.*

Furthermore, if $\beta_1 = k$, then $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_k = k$ and $H_i \cap H_j \leq M$, for all $i \neq j$.

Theorem 2.3 ([18], Theorem 3.4). *Let $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ be an irredundant cover of a group G such that $|G : X_i| = \alpha_i$ where $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_k$ and $D = \bigcap_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then*

- (a) $\alpha_2 \leq n - 1$.
- (b) If $\alpha_2 = n - 1$ then $|G : D| \leq (n - 1)^2(n - 3)!$.
- (c) If $\alpha_2 < n - 1$ then $|G : D| \leq (n - 2)^3(n - 3)!$.

Let F be an algebraic system having finite number of elements which is closed under a multiplication operation. A nonempty subset $T = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ of F is called a *set of pairwise non-commuting elements* if $r_i r_j \neq r_j r_i$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq t$. A set of pairwise non-commuting elements of F is said to be of *maximal size* if its cardinality is the largest one among all such sets.

This extends Definition 2.1 of [1]. Considering F to be a finite group Abdollahi et al. [1] have obtained several results regarding set of pairwise non-commuting elements having maximal size (see Remark 2.1, Lemma 2.4, Proposition 2.5 and Lemma 2.6 of [1]). In this section, we consider F to be a finite ring and obtain the following analogous results.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R having maximal size. Then*

- (a) $R = C_R(r_1) \cup C_R(r_2) \cup \dots \cup C_R(r_t)$
- (b) $\bigcap_{i=1}^t C_R(r_i) = Z(R)$.
- (c) $\{C_R(r_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, t\}$ is an irredundant cover of R .

Proof. (a) Suppose there exists an element $r \in R - (\bigcup_{i=1}^t C_R(r_i))$, then $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t, r\}$ is a set of $(t + 1)$ -pairwise non-commuting elements of R , which is a contradiction. Hence $R = \bigcup_{i=1}^t C_R(r_i)$.

(b) Suppose there exists an element $r \in (\bigcap_{i=1}^t C_R(r_i)) - Z(R)$, then $rs \neq sr$ for some $s \in R$. Now for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$, we define $y_i = r_i$ if $r_i s \neq s r_i$ and $y_i = r + r_i$ if $r_i s = s r_i$. Then $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t, s\}$ is a set of $(t + 1)$ -pairwise non-commuting elements of R , which is a contradiction. Hence, $\bigcap_{i=1}^t C_R(r_i) = Z(R)$.

(c) If not, then there exists a proper non-commutative centralizer $C_R(r_i)$ for some $i, 1 \leq i \leq t$ such that $C_R(r_i) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1, i \neq j}^t C_R(r_j)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ is a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R . $\square$

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of a ring R having maximal size. Then*

- (a) $t \geq 3$
- (b) $t + 1 \leq |\text{Cent}(R)|$
- (c) *If R is a ring such that every proper centralizer is commutative then for all $a, b \in R - Z(R)$ either $C_R(a) = C_R(b)$ or $C_R(a) \cap C_R(b) = Z(R)$.*

Proof. (a) Given R is not commutative, so there exist $r, s \in R - Z(R)$ such that $rs \neq sr$. Thus $\{r, s, r + s\}$ is a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R and so $t \geq 3$.

(b) Given $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t$ is a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R , so $C_R(r_1), C_R(r_2), \dots, C_R(r_t)$ all are distinct. Hence, $t + 1 \leq |\text{Cent}(R)|$.

(c) Suppose for some $a, b \in R - Z(R)$ we have $C_R(a) \cap C_R(b) \neq Z(R)$. Then there exists an element $c \in C_R(a) \cap C_R(b) - Z(R)$. Then $a, b \in C_R(c)$ and so for any $r \in C_R(a)$ we have $r \in C_R(c)$, since $C_R(a)$ is commutative. Therefore $C_R(a) \subseteq C_R(c)$. Similarly, it can be seen that $C_R(c) \subseteq C_R(a), C_R(b) \subseteq C_R(c)$ and $C_R(c) \subseteq C_R(b)$. Hence $C_R(c) = C_R(a) = C_R(b)$. $\square$

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be an n -centralizer ring such that the cardinality of pairwise non-commuting elements of R is $n - 1$. Then for every non-central elements r and s of R , $C_R(r) = C_R(s)$ or $C_R(r) \cap C_R(s) = Z(R)$.*

Proof. Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{n-1}\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R . Then $C_R(r_1), C_R(r_2), \dots, C_R(r_{n-1})$ are all distinct and so by Proposition 2.5(b), $\text{Cent}(R) = \{R, C_R(r_1), C_R(r_2), \dots, C_R(r_{n-1})\}$. Suppose for some $i, 1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, $C_R(r_i)$ is non-commutative. So there exist elements $a, b \in C_R(r_i)$ such that $ab \neq ba$. So $C_R(a) \neq R, C_R(b), C_R(r_i)$. Without any loss, we can assume that $C_R(a) = C_R(r_j)$ for some $j \neq i, 1 \leq j \leq (n - 1)$. This gives $r_i \in C_R(a) = C_R(r_j)$ and so $r_i r_j = r_j r_i$, a contradiction. Hence every proper centralizer is commutative. So by Proposition 2.5(c), we have the required result. $\square$

We conclude this section by a new characterization of 4, 5-centralizer finite rings which is analogous to [1, Lemma 2.4]. The following lemma is useful in proving Theorem 2.8.

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a ring and $|R : Z(R)| = 4$ or 8. Then $C_R(x)$ is commutative for all $x \in R - Z(R)$.*

Proof. For any $x \in R - Z(R)$ we know that, $Z(R) \subseteq Z(C_R(x)) \subseteq C_R(x) \subset R$. Therefore

$$\frac{C_R(x)/Z(R)}{Z(C_R(x))/Z(R)} \cong \frac{C_R(x)}{Z(C_R(x))}$$

and so $|\frac{C_R(x)}{Z(C_R(x))}| = 2$ or 1 . Hence $C_R(x)$ is commutative. $\square$

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of a ring R having maximal size. Then*

(a) $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ if and only if $t = 3$,

(b) $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$ if and only if $t = 4$.

Proof. (a) Suppose $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$. By Proposition 2.5, we have that $t \geq 3$ and $t + 1 \leq |\text{Cent}(R)|$ which gives $t \leq 3$. Hence $t = 3$.

Conversely, suppose that $t = 3$. Then by Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.3, we have

$$|R : Z(R)| \leq \max\{(3-1)^2(3-3)!, (3-2)^3(3-3)!\} = 4$$

which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 4$. Hence, by Theorem 2.1(a), it follows that $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$.

(b) Suppose $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$. By Proposition 2.5, we have that $t \geq 3$ and $t + 1 \leq |\text{Cent}(R)|$ which gives $t = 3$ or 4 . If $t = 3$ then by part (a), we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$, a contradiction. Hence $t = 4$. Conversely, suppose that $t = 4$. Then by Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.3, we have

$$|R : Z(R)| \leq \max\{(4-1)^2(4-3)!, (4-2)^3(4-3)!\} = 9$$

which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 4, 8$ or 9 . Suppose $|R : Z(R)| = 4$ or 8 then by Lemma 2.7 we have $C_R(r)$ is commutative for any $r \in R - Z(R)$. So, by Proposition 2.5 we have $C_R(r) \cap C_R(s) = Z(R)$ for any $r, s \in R - Z(R)$ and $r \neq s$. Also we have that for any $r \in R - Z(R)$, $|R : C_R(r)|$ divides $|R : Z(R)|$. So if $\beta_2 = 3$ then 3 divides $|R : Z(R)|$, a contradiction. Hence $\beta_2 = 2 = \beta_1$. Therefore $|R| \geq |C_R(r_1) + C_R(r_2)|$ and so $|R| \geq \frac{(|R|/2)(|R|/2)}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 4$. Hence by Theorem 2.1 (a), we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ and so by part(a), $t = 3$, a contradiction. Therefore $|R : Z(R)| = 9$, so by Theorem 2.1 (b) we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$. This completes the theorem. $\square$

3 6-centralizer finite rings

In this section, we have the following characterization of 6-centralizer finite rings.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a 6-centralizer finite ring. Then $|R : Z(R)| = 8, 12$ or 16.*

Proof. Given $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 6$. Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R having maximal size. Then $C_R(r_i), 1 \leq i \leq t$ are distinct proper centralizers of R . Suppose $S_i = C_R(r_i), 1 \leq i \leq t$ and $|S_1| \geq |S_2| \geq \dots \geq |S_t|$. Using Theorem 2.8, we have if $t = 3$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ and if $t = 4$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$. So in both cases we get contradictions. Hence using Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6, we have $t = 5$ and for every non-central elements r and s of R , $C_R(r) = C_R(s)$ or $C_R(r) \cap C_R(s) = Z(R)$. Therefore, we have that

$$|R| = \sum_{i=1}^5 |S_i| - 4|Z(R)|.$$

Suppose $|S_1| < \frac{|R|}{4}$ that is $|S_1| \leq \frac{|R|}{5}$ as $1 < |S_1| \leq \frac{|R|}{2}$. Then we have $|R| \leq |R| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R| < |R|$, a contradiction. Hence $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{2}, \frac{|R|}{3}$ or $\frac{|R|}{4}$.

Case 1: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{2}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/2)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 2|Z(R)|$ and hence $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. So $|S_3| = |S_4| = |S_5| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{2} + 8|Z(R)| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 8$.

Case 2: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{3}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/3)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 3|Z(R)|$.

Subcase (i): $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|S_3| = |S_4| = |S_5| = 2|Z(R)|$ and so $|R| = \frac{|R|}{3} + 2|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 6$, a contradiction.

Subcase (ii): $|S_2| = 3|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{3} + 3|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{2|R|}{3} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| \leq 9|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 13|Z(R)|$ and hence using Theorem 2.1, $|R : Z(R)| = 8, 12$.

Case 3: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{4}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/4)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 4|Z(R)|$.

Subcase (i): $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 2|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| = 6|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| < 8|Z(R)|$, a contradiction.

Subcase (ii): $|S_2| = 3|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 3|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| \leq 9|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| < 12|Z(R)|$ and hence $|R : Z(R)| = 8$.

Subcase (iii): $|S_2| = 4|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 4|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| - 4|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} \leq 12|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 16|Z(R)|$ and hence $|R : Z(R)| = 8, 12, 16$. Hence the theorem follows. $\square$

We conclude this section by the following theorem which shows that the converse of Theorem 3.1 is not true.

Theorem 3.2. *Let R be a non-commutative ring. If $\frac{R}{Z(R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 6$ or 8 .*

Proof. Given $\frac{R}{Z(R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Suppose $\frac{R}{Z(R)} = \{Z, r_1 + Z, \dots, r_7 + Z\}$, where $Z := Z(R)$. Then $|\text{Cent}(R)| \leq 8$.

Suppose $|\text{Cent}(R)| < 8$ then $C_R(r_i) = C_R(r_j)$ for some $1 \leq i, j \leq 7$ ($i \neq j$). Now we consider $\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z}$. Then possible orders of $\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z}$ are 2 and 4. If $|\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z}| = 2$ then $C_R(r_i) = Z \cup (r_i + Z)$ which is a contradiction, as $r_j, (r_i + r_j) \in C_R(r_i)$. So $|\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z}| = 4$ and $\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z} = \{Z, r_i + Z, r_j + Z, (r_i + r_j) + Z\} = \frac{C_R(r_j)}{Z}$. Next, we consider $\frac{C_R(r_i + r_j)}{Z}$. Here also, proceeding in a similar way, we get $|\frac{C_R(r_i + r_j)}{Z}| = 4$ and $\frac{C_R(r_i + r_j)}{Z} = \{Z, r_i + Z, r_j + Z, (r_i + r_j) + Z\}$, as $r_i, r_j \in C_R(r_i + r_j)$. Therefore $C_R(r_i) = C_R(r_j) = C_R(r_i + r_j) = Z \cup (r_i + Z) \cup (r_j + Z) \cup (r_i + r_j + Z)$. Hence $|\text{Cent}(R)| \leq 6$. If $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ then by Theorem 2.1 (a), we have $|R : Z| = 4$, a contradiction. If $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$ then by Theorem 2.1 (b), we have $|R : Z| = 9$, a contradiction. Thus $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 6$. $\square$

The group theoretic analogue of the above result can be found in [4].

4 7-centralizer finite rings

In this section, we give a characterization of 7-centralizer finite rings. We begin with the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a finite ring and $X = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R having maximal size. If $|\text{Cent}(R)| = t+2$ then there exists a proper non-commutative centralizer $C_R(r)$ which contains $C_R(r_{i_1}), C_R(r_{i_2})$ and $C_R(r_{i_3})$ for three distinct $r_{i_1}, r_{i_2}, r_{i_3} \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$.*

Proof. Suppose, there exists an $r_i \in X$ such that $S := C_R(r_i)$ is non-commutative. So $|\text{Cent}(S)| \geq 4$ and S contains at least three proper centralizers, say $C_S(s_j), j = 1, 2, 3$. Therefore by hypothesis $C_R(r_i) \neq C_R(s_j)$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Hence $|\text{Cent}(R)| > t + 2$, a contradiction. Thus each $C_R(r_i), 1 \leq i \leq t$ is commutative.

Next, suppose for an element $r \in R$, $C_R(r)$ is commutative. So, there exists an index $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ such that $r \in C_R(r_j)$. Now for any element $s \in C_R(r)$ we have $s \in C_R(r_j)$, as $C_R(r_j)$ is commutative. Therefore $C_R(r) \subseteq C_R(r_j)$. Similarly, it can be seen that $C_R(r_j) \subseteq C_R(r)$. Hence for each element $r \in R$, $C_r(R)$ is commutative if and only if $C_R(r) = C_R(r_j)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. Therefore there exists a proper centralizer $C_R(r) := T$ such that T is not commutative, as $|\text{Cent}(R)| = t + 2$. So $|\text{Cent}(T)| \geq 4$. Suppose $C_T(r_{i_1}), C_T(r_{i_2})$ and $C_T(r_{i_3})$ are three proper centralizers of T , so these are three proper centralizers of R . Hence $C_R(r)$ contains $C_R(r_{i_1}), C_R(r_{i_2})$ and $C_R(r_{i_3})$ for three distinct $r_{i_1}, r_{i_2}, r_{i_3} \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, as $|\text{Cent}(R)| = t + 2$. Thus the lemma follows. $\square$

The next result, which is analogous to [1, Lemma 2.7], is also useful.

Lemma 4.2. *Let R be a 7-centralizer ring. Then $|R : Z(R)|$ is not a power of 2.*

Proof. Suppose that $|R : Z(R)|$ is a power of 2. Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R having maximal size such that $|R : C_R(r_i)| = \beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq t$ with $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \beta_t$. By Theorem 2.8, if $t = 3$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ and if $t = 4$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$. So in both cases we get contradictions. Hence, by Proposition 2.5, we have $t = 5$ or 6.

Suppose $t = 5$. Then by Theorem 2.3, we have $\beta_2 \leq 4$. Also by Proposition 2.5 of [1], there exists a proper non-commutative centralizer $C_R(r)$ which contains $C_R(r_{i_1}), C_R(r_{i_2})$ and $C_R(r_{i_3})$ for three distinct $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$. So $C_R(r_i) \cap C_R(r_j) = Z(R)$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$, otherwise $\exists l \in C_R(r_i) \cap C_R(r_j) - Z(R)$ such that $C_R(l) \neq C_R(r_i)$ for all i and $|\text{Cent}(R)|$ will be atleast $5 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 8$, a contradiction. If $\beta_2 = 3$ then

$$|R| \geq |C_R(r_1) + C_R(r_2)| = \frac{|C_R(r_1)||C_R(r_2)|}{|C_R(r_1) \cap C_R(r_2)|} \geq \frac{(|R|/3)(|R|/3)}{|Z(R)|}$$

which gives $|R : Z(R)| \leq 9$ and so $|R : Z(R)| = 9$, as 3 divides $|R : Z(R)|$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1(b), we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$, a contradiction. If $\beta_2 = 2$ then $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2$. Therefore

$$|R| \geq |C_R(r_1) + C_R(r_2)| = \frac{|C_R(r_1)||C_R(r_2)|}{|C_R(r_1) \cap C_R(r_2)|} = \frac{(|R|/2)(|R|/2)}{|Z(R)|}$$

which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 4$. Thus, by Theorem 2.1 (a), we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$, a contradiction. Hence $\beta_2 = 4$. So by Lemma 2.2, we have $\beta_i = 4$ for $i \geq 2$. Therefore by Lemma 4.1 there exists a proper non-commutative centralizer $C_R(r)$ which contains at least three $C_R(r_i)$'s, say $i = 2, 3, 4$. Therefore $R = C_R(r_1) \cup C_R(r_5) \cup C_R(r)$ and so by Theorem 2.3, $\beta_5 = 2$, a contradiction.

Now suppose that $t = 6$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.6, we have every proper centralizer of R is commutative and for every non-central elements r and s of R , $C_R(r) = C_R(s)$ or $C_R(r) \cap C_R(s) = Z(R)$. Now for any $r + Z(R) \in \frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z(R)} \cap \frac{C_R(r_j)}{Z(R)}$ we have $r \in Z(R)$. So for any $r_i, r_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 6\}, i \neq j$, we have $\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z(R)} \cap \frac{C_R(r_j)}{Z(R)} = \{Z(R)\}$. We assume that $|\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z(R)}| = k_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 6$. Also for any $r \in R$ we have $r \in C_R(r_i)$, for some i . Therefore $\frac{R}{Z(R)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^6 \frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z(R)}$ this gives $|\frac{R}{Z(R)}| = \sum_{i=1}^6 |\frac{C_R(r_i)}{Z(R)}| - 5$ so $\sum_{i=1}^6 k_i = |\frac{R}{Z(R)}| + 5$. Hence $\sum_{i=1}^6 k_i$ is an odd integer, which is a contradiction, as all k_i s are even. Thus the lemma follows. $\square$

Now we give the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.3. *Let R be a 7-centralizer ring. Then $|R : Z(R)| = 12, 18, 20, 24$ or 25.*

Proof. Given $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 7$. Let $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_t\}$ be a set of pairwise non-commuting elements of R having maximal size. Then $C_R(r_i), 1 \leq i \leq t$ are distinct proper centralizers of R . Suppose $S_i = C_R(r_i), 1 \leq i \leq t$ and $|S_1| \geq |S_2| \geq \dots \geq |S_t|$. Using Theorem 2.8, if $t = 3$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ and if $t = 4$ then $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 5$. So in both cases we get contradictions. Hence using Proposition 2.5, we have $t = 5$ or 6.

Suppose $t = 5$. Then by Lemma 4.1 there exists a proper non-commutative centralizer $C_R(r)$ which contains $C_R(r_{i_1}), C_R(r_{i_2})$ and $C_R(r_{i_3})$ for three distinct $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$. So $C_R(r_i) \cap C_R(r_j) = Z(R)$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$, otherwise $\exists l \in C_R(r_i) \cap C_R(r_j) - Z(R)$ such that $C_R(l) \neq C_R(r_i)$ for all i and $|\text{Cent}(R)|$ will be at least $5 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 8$, a contradiction. Now using Theorem 2.3, if $|R : C_R(r_i)| = \beta_i, 1 \leq i \leq 5$ and $\beta_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \beta_5$, then $\beta_2 \leq 4$. Suppose $\beta_2 \leq 3$ then $|R| \geq |C_R(r_1) + C_R(r_2)| = \frac{|C_R(r_1)||C_R(r_2)|}{|C_R(r_1) \cap C_R(r_2)|} \geq \frac{(|R|/3)(|R|/3)}{|Z(R)|}$ gives $|R : Z(R)| \leq 9$ and so by Lemma 4.2, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 4, 9$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1, we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ or 5, a contradiction. If $\beta_2 \leq 4$, in a similar way it can be seen that $|R : Z(R)| \leq 16$. So using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12$.

Suppose $t = 6$ then using Proposition 2.6, we have for every non-central elements r and s of R , $C_R(r) = C_R(s)$ or $C_R(r) \cap C_R(s) = Z(R)$. Therefore we have

$$|R| = \sum_{i=1}^6 |C_R(i)| - 5|Z(R)|.$$

Suppose $|S_1| < \frac{|R|}{5}$ that is $|S_1| \leq \frac{|R|}{6}$ as $1 < |S_1| \leq \frac{|R|}{2}$. Then we have $|R| \leq |R| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R| < |R|$, a contradiction. Hence $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{2}, \frac{|R|}{3}, \frac{|R|}{4}$ or $\frac{|R|}{5}$.

Case 1: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{2}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/2)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 2|Z(R)|$ and hence $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Similarly it can be seen that $|S_3| = |S_4| = |S_5| = |S_6| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{2} + 10|Z(R)| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R : Z(R)| = 10$ and hence R is commutative, a contradiction.

Case 2: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{3}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/3)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 3|Z(R)|$.

Subcase (i): $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|S_3| = |S_4| = |S_5| = |S_6| = 2|Z(R)|$ which gives $|R| = \frac{|R|}{3} + 10|Z(R)| - 5|Z(R)|$ and so $|R|$ is not divisible by $|Z(R)|$, a contradiction.

Subcase (ii): $|S_2| = 3|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{3} + 3|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{2|R|}{3} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| \leq 12|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| < 18|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12$.

Case 3: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{4}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/4)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 4|Z(R)|$.

Subcase (i): $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 2|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| = 8|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 10|Z(R)|$ and hence $|R : Z(R)| = 4, 8, 9$. So using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|\text{Cent}(R)| = 4$ or 5 , a contradiction.

Subcase (ii): $|S_2| = 3|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 3|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| \leq 12|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 15|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12$.

Subcase (iii): $|S_2| = 4|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{4} + 4|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{3|R|}{4} < 16|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 21|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12, 18, 20$.

Case 4: $|S_1| = \frac{|R|}{5}$. So $|R| \geq |S_1 + S_2| = \frac{(|R|/5)|S_2|}{|Z(R)|}$ which gives $|S_2| \leq 5|Z(R)|$.

Subcase (i): $|S_2| = 2|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{5} + 2|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{4|R|}{5} < 8|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 9|Z(R)|$, a contradiction.

Subcase (ii): $|S_2| = 3|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{5} + 3|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{4|R|}{5} < |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| \leq 12|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| < 15|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12$.

Subcase (iii): $|S_2| = 4|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{5} + 4|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{4|R|}{5} < 16|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| < 20|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12, 18$.

Subcase (iv): $|S_2| = 5|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| = \frac{|R|}{5} + 5|Z(R)| + |S_3| + |S_4| + |S_5| + |S_6| - 5|Z(R)|$ which gives $\frac{4|R|}{5} \leq 20|Z(R)|$. Therefore $|R| \leq 25|Z(R)|$ and hence using Lemma 4.2, Theorem 2.1, we have $|R : Z(R)| = 12, 18, 20, 24, 25$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We conclude this paper by noting that the converse of the above theorem is true if $|R : Z(R)| = 25$.

References

- [1] A. Abdollahi, S. M. J. Amiri and A. M. Hassanabadi, Groups with specific number of centralizers, *Houston Journal of Mathematics*, **33** (1) (2007), 43–57.
- [2] A. R. Ashrafi, On finite groups with a given number of centralizers, *Algebra Colloq.*, **7** (2) (2000), 139–146.
- [3] A. R. Ashrafi, Counting the centralizers of some finite groups, *Korean J. Comput. & Appl. Math*, **7** (1) (2000), 115–124.
- [4] A. R. Ashrafi and B. Taeri, On finite groups with exactly seven element centralizers, *K J. Appl. Math & Computing*, **22** (1-2) (2006), 403–410.
- [5] S. J. Baishya, On finite groups with specific number of centralizers, *Int. Electron. J. Algebra*, **13**, 53–62, 2013.
- [6] M. Behboodi, R. Beyranvand, A. Hashemi and H. Khabazian, Classification of finite rings: theory and algorithm, *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, **64**(3) (2014), 641–658.

- [7] S. M. Belcastro and G. J. Sherman, Counting centralizers in finite groups, *Math. Magazine*, **67** (5) (1994), 366–374.
- [8] C. J. Chikunji, A Classification of a certain class of completely primary finite rings, Ring and Module Theory, Trends in Mathematics 2010, *Springer Basel AG*, 83–90.
- [9] J. B. Derr, G. F. Orr and P. S. Peck, Noncommutative rings of order p^4 , *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **97**(2) (1994), 109–116.
- [10] J. Dutta, A characterization of 4-centralizer groups, *Chinese Journal of Mathematics*, **2013** (2013), Article ID 871072, 2 pages.
- [11] J. Dutta, A characterization of 4-centralizer rings, Preprint.
- [12] J. Dutta, D. K. Basnet and R. K. Nath, Characterizing some rings of finite order, Preprint.
- [13] K. E. Eldridge, Orders for finite noncommutative rings with unity, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **75** (1968), 512–514.
- [14] B. Fine, Classification of finite rings of order p^2 , *Math. Magazine*, **66**(4) (1993), 248–252.
- [15] R.W. Goldbach and H.L. Claasen, Classification of not commutative rings with identity of order dividing p^4 , *Indag. Math.*, **6** (1995), 167–187.
- [16] D. MacHale, Commutativity in finite rings, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **83**(1976), 30–32.
- [17] R. Raghavendran, A class of finite rings, *Compositio Math.*, **22** (1970), 49–57.
- [18] M. J. Tomkinson, Groups covered by finitely many cosets or subgroups, *Comm. Algebra*, **15** (4) (1987), 845–859.